

### REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

### Amendment

Independent claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to more clearly define the conditions for displaying the additional information. These claims also have been amended to remove the informalities identified by the examiner. No new matter has been introduced.

### § 112 Rejection

Claims 1-6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶, because the examiner deems that the language “displays the read additional information by said display device” appearing after the controller in claim 1 (and similar language in claim 13) is confusing. In this respect, this superfluous language has been deleted from claims 1, 6, and 7.

### Art Rejection

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Nagata (USPGP 2002/0082027). Applicant traverses this rejection because Nagata would not have taught the searching feature with the corrected information when the search does not find the original information, as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, and 13.

Independent claims 1, 7, and 13 each call for, *inter alia*: 1) displaying the read additional information, such as watermark (claim 5), barcode (claim 6), etc., for editing, 2) prompting a user to correct the displayed additional information, 3) carrying out the search for the original file using the corrected additional information when the initial search does not find the original file based on the read additional information, and 4) outputting the copy of the original file searched without displaying the additional information for editing when the original file based on the read additional information is found.

Applicant previously argued that Nagata does not disclose or teach editing displayed additional information as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, and 13. In response, the examiner now argues that the independent claims do not define the term “additional information.” Accordingly, the examiner has construed this term to encompass any search query, including “search query words.” According to the examiner, the displayed search query words can always be edited.

Search words indeed can be edited. Even that were deemed to be the case for argument's sake, however, Nagata obtains label information, which best corresponds to the claimed "original file," based on bar code or access destination information affixed to a wine bottle. See columns 86 and 136. Nagata displays a copy of the label information with the destination information only when the label information is found, in contrast to the claimed invention. Moreover, Nagata does not display the access destination information when the label information is not found, in contrast to the claimed invention.

Specifically, Nagata displays the access destination (URL, which at best corresponds to the claimed "additional information") only when the label information is found, whereupon the user can download the label information. See paragraph 19 and Fig. 6. When a copy of the original is not found, Nagata simply cannot display the access destination. In short, Nagata fails to disclose or teach displaying the additional information for editing when a copy of the original file, namely the wine label, is not found, and not displaying the additional information when a copy of the original file is found. Accordingly, applicant submits that Nagata would not have anticipated or taught the claimed invention.

#### Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-13 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

11 APRIL 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)